

REMARKS

Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Freay for the courtesies extended during an interview conducted on March 16, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner identified PTO Form No. PTO/SB/51S as the appropriate Supplemental Declaration for filing in the subject case. No prior art references were discussed or arguments presented. Furthermore, no Exhibits were shown or demonstrations conducted.

Claims 1-60, 62-98, and 100-124 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 1, 30, 62-65, 75, 89, 91-97, and 100 have been amended, Claims 110-124 have been added, and Claims 61 and 99 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Support for the foregoing amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to for failing to incorporate the changes set forth in the Certificate of Correction issued September 1, 1998. Applicants have amended the specification to incorporate the changes set forth in the Certificate of Correction issued September 1, 1998, and therefore respectfully submit that the specification is in condition

for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 75 and 91-95 stand objected to for failing to incorporate the changes set forth in the Certificate of Correction issued September 1, 1998. Applicants have amended Claims 75 and 91-95 to correct the changes set forth in the Certificate of Correction issued September 1, 1998. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 103-109 stand objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.173(b)(2) for failing to identify amendments made relative to the patent (U.S. Pat. No. 5,741,120), as issued. Applicants have amended Claims 103-109 to show the amendments made during prosecution relative to the patent, as issued. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 24, 30, 31, 57, 89, 96 and 97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese reference JP 59-117895 ("JP '895"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 30, 89, 96, and 97 to incorporate the elements of Claim 61. Because Claim 61 was not rejected in view of the prior art, and was only rejected as being based upon a defective Reissue Declaration under 35 U.S.C. § 251, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 30,

89, 96, and 97, as well as Claims 2, 24, 31, and 57, respectively dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-18, 24, 26, 30, 32-34, 51-53, 66, 68, 84, 85, 89-92, 96, and 103-106 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 16-24 of co-pending Application No. 10/184,227 in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Pat. No. 5,336,058). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant attaches herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

REISSUE DECLARATION

Claims 1-109 stand rejected as being based upon a defective Reissue Declaration under 35 U.S.C. § 251. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit herewith a Supplemental Declaration in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.175, as suggested by the Examiner in the aforementioned interview. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 5, 2007

By: 
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca